



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MAILED

FEB 16 1979

SJFriedman Art Unit 125
05/22/78 908,597
George P. Casten et al.,

Robert E. Carnahan
Mead Johnson & Com.
2404 Penn. Ave.
Evansville, Ind. 47721

GROUP 120

THIS IS A COMMUNICATION FROM THE EXAMINER
IN CHARGE OF YOUR APPLICATION.

COMMISSIONER OF
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

- ☐ This application has been examined.
☒ Responsive to communication filed on 1-19-79.
☒ This action is made final.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S)
0 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF THIS LETTER.

FAILURE TO RESPOND WITHIN THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE WILL CAUSE THE APPLICATION TO BECOME ABANDONED.
35 U.S.C. 133

PART I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. ☐ Notice of References Cited, Form PTO-892. 2. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152 4. ☐

PART II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-9 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-9 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ The formal drawings filed on _____ are acceptable.
8. ☐ The drawing correction request filed on _____ has been ☐ approved.
☐ disapproved.
9. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has
☐ been received. ☐ been filed in parent application:
☐ not been received. serial no. _____ filed on _____
10. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the
merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 OG. 213.
11. ☐ Other

Art Unit 125

Serial No. 908,597

--
-2-

All the claims are rejected as being based on new matter under 35 USC 132. "Neuroleptically in-effective dose" does not find proper basis in the original disclosure and should be deleted. Page 6 merely states "without neuroleptic effect in a psychotic patient". The claims relate to a neurotic patient.



Stanley J. Friedman
Primary Examiner
Group Art Unit 125

SJFriedman/baf
A/C-703
557-2575